DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 365 SP 015 655

AUTHOR Bossing, Lewis
TITLE Summer Faculty Leave Project Report, 1979.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; Curriculum Design; *Data Collection; Differences; Educational Policy; *Educational Research; *Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Needs Assessment; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; *Redundancy; Research Needs; Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

A survey of admission criteria and educational practice and policy at selected preservice teacher education institutions yields data on a variety of subjects pertinent to teacher education in general. Areas of investigation explored by this combination interview/survey include the undergraduate teacher education program entrance and graduation requirements, the National Council on Accreditation for Teacher Education standards adhered to by the institutions surveyed, the work being done by the institutions in the area of teacher education laboratory experiences, the programs' academic advisement and registration policies, and the institutions' extended campus programs. Also explored are recent developments by the investigated colleges and universities in the area of teacher education curriculum design. A copy of the faculty leave proposal and the survey instrument are appended. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDPS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186365

SUMMER FACULTY LEAVE PROJECT

REPORT, 1979

Dr. Lewis Bossing, Director
Elementary/Secondary Education
Department of Instruction and Learning

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lewis Bossing

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 015655

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

It is often claimed, especially in higher education, that curriculum development and policy revision generally results in "reinvention of the wheel." That criticism has been leveled against efforts at Murray State University (M.S.U.) and its Colleges and Departments. The major purpose of this project was to limit "reinvention" in the Department of Instruction and Learning through surveying practices and policies at selected colleges and universities with general objectives similar to those of M.S.U.

Project Description

The Project began with a proposal for faculty leave to the University Leave, Tenure, and Promotion Committee. (Appendix A) The proposal specified objectives related to limitations inherent in the Department of Instruction and Learning Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experience Program, and identified a tentative list of institutions of higher education (IHE) to be surveyed. Following acceptance of the proposal by University administrators and the committee, the project was revised and expanded.

Final planning for the project resulted in an itinerary that involved personal visitation to the following I.H.E.: Austin Peay State University, Delta State University, Emporia State University, George Peabody College, Middle Tennessee State University, Nicholls State University, Pittsburg State University, Southeast Missouri University, Southeastern Louisiana University, Southwest Missouri University, University of Tennessee at Martin, and Western Kentucky University. A contact person for each I.H.E. was identified through resources in the M.S.U. Library.

An interview data form was developed to facilitate data collection and tabulation. (Appendix B) The instrument was generated from questions and concerns elicited from members of the Department of Instruction and Learning faculty and problem areas identified in the original proposal. Faculty input effectively enlarged the scope of the project and should, logically, increase interest in, and inpact of, the findings. Data were gathered from 12 institutions through personal interviews, pertinent printed materials and recording of the investigator's reactions and impressions.

DATA SUMMARY

Pertinent data, consisting of practices, policies, and personal reactions were compared across institutions. Relevant information is categorically presented in the following sections of the report.

Teacher Education Program Entrance/Exit Requirements

Admission requirements for entrance into undergraduate Teacher Education Programs varied slightly across universities surveyed. Minimum grade point average (GPA) ranged from 2.0 to 2.5 with a mode of 2.2. Most institutions required evidence of writing proficiency, generally a GPA of 2.0 in English Composition classes, or successful completion of a writing proficiency test.

All institutions required evidence of physical and psychological fitness, usually very loosely determined. Most programs required recommendations from faculty, ranging from only the student's advisor to to approval statements from as many as four faculty members. Students

were generally admitted to Teacher Education during their sophomore year, some programs required junior classification for application. None of the universities were seriously considering a five year certification program. Most spokesmen indicated they approve of such a program, but it would come only when decreed for all state institutions, probably by the State Department of Education or Legislature.

Entrance requirements for Master's degree programs in Teacher Education also differed somewhat across institutions surveyed. Minimum GPA requirements ranged from 2.25 to 2.50. Sixty-seven percent of the participants required Graduate Records Examination (GRE) scores with minimum performance ranging from 600 to 700. Twenty-five percent of the institutions required completion of the Miller Analogy Test. All institutions required applicants to hold both a Bachelor of Science or Arts Degree and teacher certification.

All graduate programs surveyed required a written and/or oral exit comprehensive examination. Less than 5% of students in these programs choose the Master's thesis option. Several institutions require students be fully admitted to a graduate program before they are eligible to register for classes.

N.C.A.T.E. Standards

Most participants were reluctant to discuss in depth their institution's procedures for meeting the N.C.A.T.E. standards concerning evaluation of Teacher Education Programs and performance of graduates from those programs. Several provided copies of their Institutional Reports for future perusal by the interviewer.

Teacher Education Laboratory Experiences

All institutions surveyed require at least eight weeks of full time student teaching. Several have sixteen weeks of student teaching, split across two or more grade levels or areas of study. Most institutions use regular faculty for student teacher supervision with the assignment making up part or all of their academic load. They are generally provided expenses, mileage and meals for out-of-town supervision. The load formula for university supervisors ranges from two student teachers for one credit hour equivalence, to three student teachers for one hour credit. Some adjustments are usually made when extensive travel is required.

Opportunity for summer student teaching is quite limited, except for institutions where laboratory schools operate during the summer. Summer placements are more common for kindergarten and special education than for regular Elementary and Secondary teaching.

Pre-student teaching laboratory experiences were fairly similar across institutions surveyed. Most were associated with introductory education classes or teaching methods classes. They generally included observation, tutoring, and small group instruction. Providing those experiences during summer school is a pervasive problem. Some schools do not offer laboratory experience courses during the summer, and others offer those courses and omit the laboratory experiences. Placement for early laboratory experiences is usually arranged by course professors or high school department chairmen in participating schools. Few institutions have budgeted funds to support pre-student teaching laboratory experiences and students are usually required to provide transportation to participating schools. There seems to be little attention to student performance in these settings or to professor

functioning during off-campus participation activities.

Academic Advisement and Registration

Assignment of academic advisors was very consistent across participating institutions. In all cases, those assignments were made by the Departmental Chairperson or Program Director. One institution assigned all freshmen to an advising center and transferred them to departmental advisors as sophomores. Most institutions considered faculty member area of expertise and work load (teaching, research, and service) when determining advisee assignments. There appears to be a general attempt to equalize advisee loads.

Most schools visited consider advising as part of the faculty members contractual responsibility. Two institutions used advising load and advisor proficiency as a factor in determining salary increases. Advisor competence is generally assessed informally by the chairman or director. Some institutions utilize student evaluation and feedback to evaluate advisor proficiency and several require a minimum number of scheduled office hours to facilitate counseling and advising.

Registration, both undergraduate and graduate, is a problem area for most institutions surveyed. Most have computerized pre-registration systems followed by regular or late registration. Some schools provided for registration through the mail. Most survey participants had discreet time intervals scheduled for registration. Registration for on-campus evening classes at several institutions, is facilitated through late open hours by the Registrar's Office for the first one or two weeks each semester. Registration for off-campus classes ranges from faculty members being totally responsible to having representatives from the Registrar's Office and/or Office of Continuing Education complete the entire registration process.

Extended Campus Programs

All of the institutions surveyed did provide off-campus instruction. Several schools mandated that all classes, on or off-campus, be part of the faculty members teaching load. Several allowed faculty members to teach one overload class per semester and two institutions limited over-load teaching to one course per year.

Compensation for off-campus teaching ranged from mileage only for in-load classes, to $1,250 plus mileage and expenses, for over-load classes. Several schools considered distance and/or time required to reach the site in determining compensation of off-campus teaching. One program allowed .19 cents per mile for automobile travel. Most institutional representatives indicated that they restricted the use of adjunct professors and some, ostensibly, used them only in emergency situations. One representative admitted heavy use of adjunct faculty. Most respondents indicated that off-campus classes were supposed to be equal, in quantity and quality of professorial and student effort, to on-campus classes. Many also stated that the classes were not generally equivalent. Student evaluation of courses and instructors was most widely used to control quality of off-campus instruction.. A few administrators indicated that off-campus teaching, as opposed to regular teaching, is viewed positively in promotion and tenure consideration.

Five of the 12 institutions surveyed had organized, school based programs. Those ranged from curriculum development projects to total leadership programs with full time university faculty on site. One school conducts seven such school based programs. Control of those programs is generally centered with university administrators, but in one case, school district officials were leaders and decision-makers. Staffing, for those programs and projects, usually comes from university faculty, in some instances with no monetary compensation. School district personnel and adjunct faculty are

used to augment these efforts.

Four of the five institutions cooperating in such programs indicated that their efforts were felt to be effective and well received. The other school did not wish to respond concerning program effectiveness or value.

Teacher Education Program Curricula

Little remarkable was found by the survey pertaining to undergraduate and graduate Teacher Education Program curricula. The number of hours required for general education, in undergraduate programs, ranged from a low of 42 hours to a high of 53 hours. Programs generally required approximately 12 to 15 hours in the major areas of communication and humanities, science and mathematics, and social science. Programs also required electives or courses mandated for certification. Most programs required a professional education core of from six to twelve hours which included Educational Psychology, Human Development, and the study of exceptional children. Total professional education hours ranged from a minimal requirement in educational foundations and field experience in Elementary and Secondary Education, to a total of 46 semester hours in the former and 25 hours in the latter.

Most graduate programs examined were traditional in nature, requiring 30 to 33 semester hours of core courses and electives. Program control, concerning the elective areas, is the responsibility of the academic advisor, and ultimately, the Dean of the College of Education or the Graduate Dean. All institutions allowed the use of independent study courses to some extent. Some schools permitted one or two independent study courses per student, and only with valid rationale. Other institutions permitted freer use of independent study courses. One school allowed independent study only if provided through the students advisor.

Faculty compensation for supervision of independent study varied greatly. Some institutions provided no compensation for working with independent study students. Utilization of the instructional technique was limited at those schools. At other institutions, formulas of one course (three hours) for five independent studies to one course for fifteen independent studies were used to compute faculty teaching loads. In some cases, the number of independent study students supervised was allowed to accumulate over semesters.

PERSPECTIVE AND SUGGESTIONS

An observers perception of policies and practices will be influenced by the procedures with which they are most familiar. The writers retrospection will be a comparison, of sorts, between M.S.U. and the institutions who participated in the study.

Undergraduate teacher education program entrance requirements are quite similar and those requirements at M.S.U. fall within that narrow range. Most institutions favor a five year basic program, but do not anticipate moving to such a program in the near future. Assuming a five year program is desirable, statewide or regional action should be taken to endorse and support a unified movement toward the addition of another year of study for basic certification.

Most graduate programs surveyed required the GRE, at some criterion level, as an admission examination. Some programs required the Miller Analogy Test or National Teacher Examination, or some combination of the three exams. Several programs required full admission to graduate programs before students were eligible to register for classes. It seems that registration and student/advisor communication could be improved if all M.S.U. graduate programs required and enforced entrance testing and formal admission

prior to registration for coursework.

It is obvious that many N.C.A.T.E. accredited Teacher Education Programs have difficulty meeting, in a straight-forward fashion, the standards concerning evaluation of Teacher Education Programs and performance of graduates from those programs. There is an effort, in the Department of Instruction and Learning, to identify optimal evaluation procedures and revise and adapt them for use. This is especially crucial in light of the fast approaching deadline for preparation of an institutional report for N.C.A.T.E. evaluation.

Student teaching experiences at the various schools are similar to the M.S.U. options. They generally range from eight to sixteen weeks of full-time experience and in one or more grade levels or subject matter areas. Summer school student teaching placements, also like M.S.U., are generally unavailable unless the institution has a laboratory school.

Pre-student teaching laboratory experiences were universal among the schools surveyed. Those programs were often unfunded and relied heavily upon individual faculty member initiative and uncompensated cooperation from proximity school administrators and teachers. The M.S.U. Pre-student Teaching Laboratory Experience Program appears to be on the cutting edge of the movement toward more effective early laboratory experience for pre-service teachers. It was also noted that many institutions, where laboratory experiences are an integral part of specific courses, will not offer those courses when placements are unavailable, such as during summer sessions.

Academic advising and student registration appear to be an area of concern at many institutions. Some practices that are used to improve

service in these areas may be worth consideration at M.S.U. One procedure is to evaluate advisor proficiency through student feedback and/or administrator review and utilize those data in salary and promotion decisions.

Advising and registration seems to be improved where faculty are required to commit a reasonable amount of scheduled time for those activities. Institutions that identify discreet intervals of time for registration feel that method is more economical than a continuous system. M.S.U. registration might be strengthened through a mail facilitated option and through a scheduled extension of office hours by advisors and appropriate university staff.

Institutions with extended campus programs tend to have concerns about faculty overload teaching, the use of adjunct teaching faculty, and the equivalence between on-campus and off-campus experiences. It seems that faculty members should have the perogative of teaching an overload class if their teaching, research, consulting, and service schedule allows, and if the course would not require an inordinate amount of effort. Adjunct faculty should be employed only in emergency situations or when required expertise is not available among the regular faculty. Off-campus classes, per se, will probably not be equivalent to regular campus classes unless physical resources and faculty and student activities comensurate in the extended campus setting.

Institutions with school-based programs perceive them as quite effective and student reaction is positive regarding their impact. The M.S.U. school-based programs are at least equal to any observed. This suggests that the M.S.U. effort is timely and should be supported by university administrators and faculty, as well as regional school administrators and teachers.

Data concerning undergraduate teacher education program curricula suggest two implications for M.S.U. programs. One is the prevalence of a

core of courses for students in all Teacher Education Programs, and the other relates to the overall professional education hours required for different certification programs. A professional education core should be considered for M.S.U., as should the inclusion of more laboratory experiences in some program curricula, particularly the Secondary Education Program.

One area of discrepancy in graduate programs studied was the utililization of independent study courses. Data suggest that M.S.U. faculty consider establishing an upper limit on the number of independent study hours used in a program of studies and that some system be developed to insure that such study be consistent with the student's planned program. It is also suggested that a formula to compute load equivalence be adopted for faculty who supervise independent study at M.S.U. A ten-student load of independent study to equal one three-hour class seems appropriate, and allowing credit to accumulate over semesters adds desirable flexibility.

A few general impressions that fall outside identified topics are left with the writer. One is that it is a rewarding and professional growth experience to visit with colleagues in different regions and discover that situations and problems are amazingly similar. It is not best, however, to attempt to ask for their time during summer sessions. They appear to be as busy as summer faculty here at M.S.U. The writer, however, had many professional discussions, several social interactions, and found he was spending at least as much time explaining "how we do it", as receiving and recording practices and policies at participating institutions.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY LEAVE PROPOSAL

FACULTY LEAVE PROPOSAL

Dr. Lewis Bossing

Introduction

Culmination of the 1978-79 academic year will conclude four years of service for me as a faculty member in the Department of Instruction and Learning. I am, therefore, applying for Summer leave to commence June 11, 1978 and extend through the scheduled Summer Session. The activity planned for that time period will enable me to develop professionally and provide data relative to on-going curriculum development in the Department of Instruction and Learning.

Purpose

One trend in teacher education is the utilization of laboratory experiences, in school settings, prior to traditional student teaching. Such experiences are mandated by N.C.A.T.E., recommended by the Kentucky State Department of Education, and shown by research to be beneficial to teaching effectiveness. The Department of Instruction and Learning has incorporated pre-student teaching laboratory experiences into its undergraduate education programs. However, several conditions have kept the program from being optimally effective. Those conditions include:

1. Limited opportunities for placement in the immediate M.S.U. area.
2. No summer school pupils for placement of students in summer classes.
3. Difficulty in scheduling adequate time for appropriate participation.
4. Lack of alternatives to existing participation modes.

I plan to personally survey selected university pre-student teaching participation programs to collect data concerning the problems impacting in our present program. Those data will be used to recommend changes and improvements in our department curriculum.

Procedure

Week 1 (June 11-15)

Contact selected universities and schedule visits.

Develop data collection instruments. (Observation and Interview Forms)

Complete travel plans.

Week 2 (June 18-22)

Visit: 1. University of Tennessee at Martin

2. Southeastern Missouri University

Week 3 (June 25-29)

Visit: 3. Austin Peay University

4. Middle Tennessee State University

5. George Peabody College

Week 4 (July 2-6)

Visit: 6. Southeastern Louisiana University

7. Northwestern Louisiana University

Week 5 (July 9-13)

Visit: 8. University of New Orleans

9. Nicholls State University

Week 6 (July 16-20)

Visit: 10. Southwestern Missouri University

11. Emporia State University

12. Fort Hays State University

Week 7 (July 23-27)

Compile data.

Draft report.

Week 8 (July 30-August 3)

Write report.

The schedule listed is, of course, tentative. Schools identified were selected on the bases of similarity to M.S.U. and accessability to the researcher.

Documentation

Data will be summarized and analyzed. The analyses, conclusions, and recommendations will be contained in a written report submitted to the Faculty Leave Committee and the Faculty and Administration of the Department of Instruction and Learning.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Survey Instrument (Bossing)

Institution: _____

_____

_____

Date: _____

Participants: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

I. Program Entrance/Exit Requirements

A. Teacher Education Program(s) U.G.

1. Admission Criteria:

2. Exams/Assessment:

3. When admitted

4. Consideration of a 5 Year Program

B. Graduate Programs

1. Admission Criteria:

2. Exams/Assessment

3. Exit Requirement
Comprehensive Exam

Thesis

II. N C A T E Standards

A. Evaluation of performance of graduation

1. Basic Programs

2. Advanced Programs

B. Evaluation of T.E. Programs

1. Evaluation

2. Use of Results

C. Structure and function of T.E. Committee

D. Planning for Multi-Cultural Education:

III. Laboratory Experience

A. Student Teaching

1. Design and nature of experience

2. Load equivalency for university supervisors

3. Reward system

Supervisory teachers

University supervisors

4. Summer student teaching or equivalent experience

B. Pre-student teaching laboratory experiences

1. Design and nature of experiences

2. Function during summer session

3. Coordinator
   University coordinator/director

4. Transportation

5. Funding

6. How are cooperating teachers
   -Recruited

   -Oriented

   -Rewarded

7. How is performance of university professors monitored

IV. Academic Advisement/Registration

A. Academic Advisement

1. Assignment of advisors

2. Reward system

3. Performance monitoring

B. Registration

1. General scheme

2. For night classes

3. For off-campus classes

V. Extended Campus Programs

A. Off-campus classes

1. Compensation, pay, milage

2. Restrictions on faculty use

3. Adjunct faculty

4. Quality control

5. Reward system

B. Organized Programs

1. Nature

2. Number

3. Control

4. Staffing

5. Effectiveness

VI. Teacher Education Program Curricula

A. Undergraduate

1. General education component

2. Core

Placement in curriculum

Number of hours

Content

Effectiveness

3. Professional component

B. Graduate

1. Nature of programs

2. Flexibility

3. Program control

C. Infusion of mandated areas

1. Career education

2. Mainstreaming

3. Consumer education

4. Other mandated programs

VII. Environmental Education

A. Pre-student program

B. Graduate/inservice programs

VIII. Miscellaneous

A. Independent Study Courses

1. Nature

2. Purpose(s)

3. Relationship to teaching load

B. Faculty role in Governance

1. Committee service

2. Service as it applies to university reward system

3. Administrative structure of College of Education and Department of Education